

**City Council Budget Subcommittee
Staff Responses to Subcommittee Questions
March 11, 2004 Meeting**

Councilman Littlefield's, (Chairman) Questions:

Question: What is the City's current water quality charge?

Response: In the late 1980's, the City Council implemented a Water Quality charge to demonstrate the impact of existing and/or pending unfunded Federal water quality regulations. The fee appears on the customer bill under the Environmental section as a "Water Quality" charge and is calculated at the rate of 2.677% of the combined Water base and usage fee amounts.

Question: What is included in the contingent \$3.5 million of Public Safety services?

Response: A Public Safety white paper outlining the proposed use of \$4.2 million of the Public Safety Sales Tax, which is contingent on the May 18th vote, is attached to this response.

Question: Why don't we appropriate all \$7.9 million of the public safety sales tax for maximum flexibility?

Response: The *updated* proposed budget includes \$4.2 million (formerly \$3.5 million) of Public Safety Sales Tax. The detail of the proposed \$4.2 million of public safety expenditures and the reason for the increase from the original \$3.5 million are included in the attached Public Safety whitepaper. Should Council desire to increase the proposed appropriations for public safety services the adjustment would need to occur prior to the May 17th tentative budget adoption, which sets the City's legal spending limit.

Question: How will the Tourism and Development Commission (TDC) use the additional funding from the proposed 80%/20% modification to the bed tax allocation?

Response: In order to increase the number of visitors staying overnight in Scottsdale hotels, the intent of the Tourism Development Commission's (TDC) recommendation to modify the bed tax allocation is to ensure that sufficient funds are available for a competitive and effective destination marketing program as currently administered by the Scottsdale Convention and Visitors Bureau (SCVB), as well as for the other components of the tourism development program.

The proposed budget recommends providing additional funding of nearly \$900,000 to the SCVB for the Destination Marketing Program. The following represents the major components of the proposed funding increase and the related comments:

Additional amount from modifying bed tax allocation to 80%	\$895,456
Minus: destination marketing shift from General Fund to Bed Tax	<u>(\$770,000)</u> (a)
	\$125,356
Minus: 2% increase to SCVB Base Marketing	<u>(79,120)</u> (b)
Remaining unallocated balance	\$46,236 (c)

- (a) The \$770,000 *Culture Quest* expenditure in the General Fund budget for the past two years would be eliminated and paid from the proposed modified bed tax allocation. Eliminating *Culture Quest* and providing \$770,000 from bed tax funds instead to the SCVB's destination marketing program would maintain (not increase) SCVB funding at the same level as the past two years. The advantage to this re-allocation is that the funds would be "unencumbered" and available to be used for marketing priorities dictated by current research and market conditions, as opposed to a mandated program. Any lesser amount would be a net loss of funds to the SCVB, requiring cutbacks and reductions in the marketing program.

- (b) The proposed budget also includes a 2.0% increase in the SCVB contract, which mirrors the City's anticipated 2.0% increase in the bed tax. The Destination Marketing Program has not increased in three years.
- (c) After considering these two changes only \$46,236 remains unallocated.

Therefore, the majority of the projected increase would be allocated to the SCVB's Destination Marketing Program. Among the proposed uses intended to generate additional room nights in Scottsdale hotels are:

- Implementing the recommendations of the "2003 Group Meeting Market Study" (Gerard Murphy and Associates), a combination of additional direct sales staff and target marketing
- Implementing the elements of a more effective, targeted advertising and marketing campaign in response to the recent focus group studies
- Increased number of industry "familiarization trips", travel writer conferences, and trade show participation to heighten Scottsdale's visibility and brand awareness

Vice Mayor Ecton's Questions:

Question: Do we have the Development Fees by category?

Response: In general the development fees are categorized as follows below:

General Fund User Fees – collected by and for Planning & Development Services

- Development Application Fees
- Plan Review Fees
- Building Permit Fees and Encroachment Permit Fees

Enterprise Fees – collected by Planning & Development for Water Resources

- Water Development Fees
- Water Resources Development Fees
- Sewer Development Fees

A five-year revenue history by category is provided below:

The following are specifically related to the first category above, General Fund User Fees:

Development Application Fees have generated the following amount of user fee revenues:

FY1998-99	\$ 588,583
FY 1999-00	\$ 748,264
FY 2000-01	\$ 600,999
FY 2001-02	\$1,019,810
FY 2002-03	\$ 888,330

Plan Review Fees have generated the following amount of user fee revenues:

FY1998-99	\$3,558,628
FY 1999-00	\$4,259,371
FY 2000-01	\$4,912,457
FY 2001-02	\$5,229,093
FY 2002-03	\$4,988,070

Building Permits Fees and Encroachment Permit Fees have generated the following amount of user fee revenues:

FY1998-99	\$10,163,662
FY 1999-00	\$11,633,200
FY 2000-01	\$11,337,027
FY 2001-02	\$ 9,524,595
FY 2002-03	\$ 9,570,630

The following are specifically related to Water, Water Resources, and Development Fees, which are receipted in the CIP to pay for associated development driven capital costs:

Water Development

FY1998-99	\$ 8,284,011
FY 1999-00	\$ 9,209,535
FY 2000-01	\$10,542,406
FY 2001-02	\$ 5,939,983
FY 2002-03	\$ 7,460,787

Water Resource Development Fees

FY1998-99	\$11,762,310
FY 1999-00	\$15,352,223
FY 2000-01	\$16,403,293
FY 2001-02	\$ 7,870,584
FY 2002-03	\$ 9,616,820

Sewer Development Fees

FY1998-99	\$20,155,717
FY 1999-00	\$ 9,300,994
FY 2000-01	\$ 9,958,116
FY 2001-02	\$ 7,216,234
FY 2002-03	\$ 7,269,331

Question: Can we get an extension on arsenic compliance?

Response: Under the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act, EPA is authorized to incorporate exemptions to ensure compliance with revised water quality standards, including arsenic. The implementation of the exemptions is under the administration of the States. The State of Arizona is in the process of determining how the exemptions will be administered, including a required extensive public comment and review period. An exemption request would only be considered by the State if the City determines that it cannot meet the arsenic standards by January 2006. Since the City is on schedule to meet the arsenic standards in a timely manner, a request for exemption is not appropriate at this time. If a determination were ever made of possible non-compliance, an exemption request would be presented to the City Council for submission to the State. In granting an exemption the State must adhere to established specific eligibility criteria including a requirement for an extensive public notification process. All City construction contracts currently include delay penalties.

Question: Do we have an MTBE problem?

Response: In compliance with the Federal Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring rule, Scottsdale tested all of the groundwater wells and surface water supplies, which resulted in non-detection of MTBE. These results are reported to the all of Scottsdale's water customers through the annual 2003 Water Quality Report as mandated by EPA. If there are any revisions to the rules on MTBE, the Council will be updated. The City will continue to implement any monitoring and/or reporting requirements.

Question: Will we run into problems due to not having arsenic treatment changes in completed prior to federal deadline?

Response: While the State Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) has yet to issue specific regulations, EPA guidance recommends that water systems not meeting the deadline would issue official public notification through its annual consumer confidence report and submit a remedial action plan to ADEQ for approval.

Question: What is the City's fuel cost total for the year? What assumptions did we make in forecasting costs for FY 2004/05?

Response: The following is a summary of the City's fuel costs:

FY1998-99	\$ 765,720 actual
FY 1999-00	\$1,129,579 actual
FY 2000-01	\$1,335,303 actual
FY 2001-02	\$1,217,903 actual
FY 2002-03	\$1,248,438 actual
FY 2003-04	\$1,450,143 forecasted (budget \$1,340,500)
FY 2004-05	\$1,581,510 budgeted

The assumptions for FY2004/05 by fuel type are noted below:

City vehicles use three types of fuel. The assumptions listed below are based on historical data, the number and types of vehicles, and usage.

Unleaded: 590,00 gallons @ \$1.48*	\$873,200
Diesel/Bio-Diesel: 490,000 gal. @ \$1.31*	\$641,900
CNG: 50,000 gal. @ \$1.33*	<u>\$ 66,500</u>
	\$1,581,600

* the City purchases fuel from a state contract plus is exempt from federal excise taxes; therefore, the price per gallon would be lower than the current retail pay by a citizen at the pump.

Councilman Ortega's Question:

Question: How much would it cost to add commercial recycling in clustered areas?

Response: The city already provides recycling service as an option for commercial/multi-family customers. This was implemented at the recommendation of the Maximus Report covering the Municipal Services Department. Attached is a follow-up response to the Maximus report addressing the actions taken by the City to address the availability of recycling to commercial businesses and multi-family units.

Also, attached is a list of existing commercial and multi-family complexes participating in the recycling program. In addition, there are a number of recycling drop-off points strategically located throughout the City.

This is the link to commercial recycling information on the website:

<http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Recycle/CommRecycling.asp>

The main obstacles encountered with commercial/multi-family recycling are:

- High contamination rates (garbage placed in the recycling container)
- Space limitations (no place for additional containers in the parking lot)
- Customer has private collection service (commercial properties are not required to participate in city refuse collection)
- Customer does not have any interest in the recycling program
- Customer does not want to pay for the recycling service

Residential or business tenants located within non-participant complexes that desire recycling could either encourage their property owner or manager to participate, or use the recycling drop-off points located through the city. They may contact the city at (480) 312-5600 for recycling drop-off locations.

The information presented below outlines the *updated* proposed uses for \$4.2 million of the contingent Public Safety Sales Tax. The \$4.2 million represents \$3.5 million from the proposed FY 2004/05 General Fund budget and \$0.6 million for a Parks/Preserve Police Unit, which was added to the proposed uses subsequent to the March 9th budget release. The additional sales tax revenue and expanded public safety services expenditures of \$4.2 million are contingent on the May 18th vote to increase the City's sales tax rate dedicated to public safety. Should the voters approve the ballot initiative, staff recommends an increase in the following priority public safety service areas during FY 2004/05:

- \$0.8 million Traffic Enforcement
- \$0.2 million Code Enforcement
- \$1.3 million District 1
- \$0.2 million Vice Enforcement
- \$0.7 million Cyber Crime Unit
- \$38,000 Police Records
- \$34,400 Crime Laboratory
- \$23,800 City Court
- \$0.1 million City Facility and Workplace Security
- \$0.2 million Photo Radar Enforcement
- \$0.6 million Parks/Preserve Police Unit (*proposed after the March 9th budget release to City Council*)

As note above, the *updated* proposed FY 2004/05 General Fund budget includes \$4.2 million of contingent expenditures for additional public safety expenditures, which is contingent on voter approval of a May 18th ballot measure for a dedicated 0.10 percent sales tax for public safety. The contingent public safety expenditures are included in the proposed budget to give Council flexibility to adjust the budget should voters approve this measure. The City must include the additional expenditures to comply with the State of Arizona's requirements for adoption of the tentative budget. By State law, the tentative budget adoption sets the City's annual maximum legal expenditure limit. Council may not increase the limit after the tentative adoption, which is currently scheduled for Monday, May 17th. In the event the public safety ballot initiative is not approved, the City Council may lower the appropriation amounts when it adopts the final budget in June.

The proposed \$4.2 million of public safety service enhancements by service area are summarized below:

Public Safety Enhancements by Service Area

Title	FTE	Total	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	Apr-05	May-05	Jun-05
Traffic Enforcement														
Police Officer	1.00	\$63,382												
Police Officer	1.00	\$63,382												
Police Officer	1.00	\$63,382												
Police Sergeant	1.00	\$89,904												
Police Officer	1.00	\$31,690												
Police Officer	1.00	\$31,690												
Police Officer	1.00	\$31,690												
Police Officer	1.00	\$31,690												
	8.00	\$406,811	Personal Services											
		\$6,001	Contractual											
		\$180,116	Commodities - Officer equipment (radios, uniforms, guns, ammunition, etc.)											
		\$186,500	Capital Outlay - Officer vehicles/motorcycles											
		\$779,428	Total											

Proposed Public Safety Sales Tax Uses
Contingent on May 18, 2004 Vote
Proposed FY 2004/05 Budget

Title	FTE	Total	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	Apr-05	May-05	Jun-05
Code Enforcement														
Code Inspector	1.00	\$61,091												
Code Inspector	1.00	\$61,091												
	2.00	\$122,182												
			Personal Services											
		\$4,006	Contractual - Training; software											
		\$3,486	Commodities - Standard office furniture											
		\$58,000	Capital Outlay - Inspector vehicles; computers											
		\$187,674	Total											

Title	FTE	Total	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	Apr-05	May-05	Jun-05
District 1														
Police Officer	1.00	\$47,536												
Police Officer	1.00	\$47,536												
Police Officer	1.00	\$47,536												
Police Officer	1.00	\$47,536												
Police Officer	1.00	\$47,536												
Police Officer	1.00	\$47,536												
Police Sergeant	1.00	\$67,428												
Police Sergeant	1.00	\$67,428												
Police Lieutenant	1.00	\$77,009												
Police Officer	1.00	\$47,536												
Police Officer	1.00	\$47,536												
Police Officer	1.00	\$47,536												
Police Officer	1.00	\$47,536												
	13.00	\$687,228												
			Personal Services											
		\$10,606	Contractual											
		\$200,476	Commodities - Standard office furniture; officer equipment (radios, uniforms, guns, ammunition, etc.)											
		\$380,000	Capital Outlay - Officer vehicles; leased space improvements											
		\$1,278,310	Total											

Title	FTE	Total	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	Apr-05	May-05	Jun-05
Vice Enforcement														
Police Officer	1.00	\$64,232												
Police Officer	1.00	\$64,232												
	2.00	\$128,464												
			Personal Services											
		\$24,672	Contractual - Leased undercover vehicles; training											
		\$37,530	Commodities - Officer equipment (radios, uniforms, guns, ammunition, etc.)											
		\$190,666	Total											

Proposed Public Safety Sales Tax Uses
Contingent on May 18, 2004 Vote
Proposed FY 2004/05 Budget

Title	FTE	Total	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	Apr-05	May-05	Jun-05
Cyber Crime Unit														
Police Officer	1.00	\$32,540												
Police Officer	1.00	\$32,540												
Police Officer	1.00	\$32,540												
Police Officer	1.00	\$32,540												
Police Officer	1.00	\$32,540												
Police Officer	1.00	\$32,540												
Police Sergeant	1.00	\$45,801												
7.00		\$241,044	Personal Services											
		\$35,457	Contractual - Training; software maintenance and licensing											
		\$225,011	Commodities - Forensic recovery computer systems; officer equipment (radios, uniforms, guns, ammunition, etc.)											
		\$220,000	Capital Outlay - Officer vehicles											
		\$721,512	Total											

Title	FTE	Total	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	Apr-05	May-05	Jun-05
Police Records														
Police Support Spec	1.00	\$38,047												
1.00		\$38,047	Personal Services											

Title	FTE	Total	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	Apr-05	May-05	Jun-05
Crime Laboratory														
Criminalist II	1.00	\$32,219												
1.00		\$32,219	Personal Services											
		\$1,550	Contractual - Training											
		\$596	Commodities - Lab supplies											
		\$34,365	Total											

Title	FTE	Total	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	Apr-05	May-05	Jun-05
City Court														
Court Service Rep	1.00	\$21,118												
1.00		\$21,118	Personal Services											
		\$750	Contractual - Training											
		\$250	Commodities - Office supplies											
		\$1,707	Capital Outlay - Computer equipment											
		\$23,825	Total											

**Proposed Public Safety Sales Tax Uses
Contingent on May 18, 2004 Vote
Proposed FY 2004/05 Budget**

Title	FTE	Total	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	Apr-05	May-05	Jun-05
City Facility & Workplace Security														
Municipal Security Tech	1.00	\$59,763												
	1.00	\$59,763	Personal Services											
		\$4,583	Contractual - Training; software maintenance											
		\$10,510	Commodities - Standard office equipment/furniture											
		\$74,856	Total											
Photo Enforcement														
		\$213,432	Contractual - Expand photo radar services											
Subtotal	36.00	\$1,736,874	Personal Services											
		\$301,057	Contractual											
		\$657,975	Commodities											
		\$846,207	Capital Outlay											
		\$3,542,113	Total											

As mentioned above, the following service was added to the proposed enhanced public safety services list, subsequent to the March 9th release of the City's proposed FY 2004/05 budget. The addition of this service brings the updated contingent public safety expenditures total to approximately \$4.2 million.

Title	FTE	Total	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	Apr-05	May-05	Jun-05
Parks/Preserve Police Unit														
Police Officer	1.00	\$63,382												
Police Officer	1.00	\$63,382												
Police Officer	1.00	\$63,382												
Police Sergeant	1.00	\$89,904												
Police Officer	1.00	\$31,690												
Police Officer	1.00	\$31,690												
Police Officer	1.00	\$31,690												
Police Officer	1.00	\$31,690												
	8.00	\$406,811	Personal Services											
		\$8,920	Contractual											
		\$121,920	Commodities - Officer equipment (radios, uniforms, guns, ammunition, etc.); mountain bikes, horse and mounted specialty equipment											
		\$112,750	Capital - Officer utility vehicles; flat bed trailer											
		\$650,401	Total											
Grand Total	44.00	\$2,143,685	Personal Services											
		\$309,977	Contractual											
		\$779,895	Commodities											
		\$958,957	Capital											
		\$4,192,514	Total											

While this memo highlights the approximately \$4.2 million of contingent expenditures included in the *updated* proposed budget, Council may modify staff's recommended use of the contingent funds and/or the amount of contingent funding included in the tentative budget adoption. To comply with the State's expenditure limits, any modification to the amount of contingent funding included in the budget would need to occur before Council's tentative budget adoption on May 17th.

Again, all of these expenditures are a FY 2004/05 budget priority but are contingent on voter approval of the May 18th Public Safety Sales Tax.

Staff Contacts: Alan Rodbell, Chief, extension, 25310
 Craig Clifford, General Manager, extension 22427
 Art Rullo, Budget Director, extension 22427

Recommendation 19: The recycling program should be expanded, a more aggressive recycling objective adopted, and the extent of waste diversion recalculated... (2) Utilize a number of tools to expand the extent of recycling by businesses. (3) Expand the recycling program for multi-family dwellings....

Response: 19. 2) We concur and have moved forward with this recommendation as current resources and outside factors allow. The Solid Waste Management Division has placed an increased focus on promoting commercial recycling and utilizing this service as a marketing tool to existing and potential customers. We currently have 143 90-gallon and 300-gallon residential recycling containers placed at various businesses, schools and multi-family complexes, and an additional 58 drop-off containers located at various sites throughout the City. To minimize the cost to our customers, these containers are serviced on residential recycling days by our residential collection crews working in their area.

We have increased this effort by promoting commercial recycling availability on our Solid Waste Management website, and through the development of promotional pamphlets and other literature. Commercial recycling is also being promoted to potential new customers as an additional benefit of using City-provided commercial refuse collection services. Additionally, we are conducting a commercial cardboard recycling program on a pilot basis.

Our current practice with existing commercial recycling accounts is to charge at the rate our residential customers pay, with the exception of non-profit entities. Our current marketing practice does stress that the cost of a successful recycling program could be offset by reduced commercial refuse collection needs.

At this time we have developed a commercial recycling rate schedule designed to recover the cost of providing these services. For example, the monthly fee for servicing one 90-gallon recycling container weekly is \$7.00.

Timeline: Completed January 2003.

Promote and advertise commercial recycling program. Ongoing.

January 2004 Progress Report: Staff continues to promote the availability of commercial recycling as a marketing tool to potential customers

Responsible Staff: Rick Pence, Mark Powell, James Livingston

Response: 19. 3) We concur have moved forward with this recommendation as current resources and outside factors allow. The Solid Waste Management Division has placed an increased focus on promoting multi-family commercial recycling and utilizing this service as a marketing tool to existing and potential customers. We currently have 43 recycling containers located at 14 multi-family complexes. We also have drop-off containers located at various sites throughout the City that we make available to residents of multi-family complexes whose management has no interest in participating in our recycling program or who have private collection services. To minimize costs, our residential collection crews working in their area service these containers on residential recycling days.

We plan to increase this effort by promoting commercial recycling availability on our Solid Waste Management website, and through the development of promotional pamphlets and other literature. We receive periodic inquiries from individual residents of multi-family dwellings who wish to recycle, but have complex management, which has no interest in providing this service to its tenants. To accommodate these people we have sited 35 drop-off containers at 13 locations throughout the city that these individuals can use.

A common problem with multi-family commercial recycling programs is a high level of material contamination, which could impact our contract terms with the Salt River Landfill. Successful multi-family commercial recycling programs are only achieved through an on-going commitment from complex management and their staff. We address contamination issues through frequent container inspections by City staff and working with the complex to address concerns. Continuing contamination problems do result in removal from the recycling program.

Providing recycling collection and staff costs the City money that must be recovered through user fees. Our current practice with existing multi-family commercial recycling accounts is to charge at the rate our residential customers pay. Offering no cost recycling services would require the costs of these services to be absorbed by residential or commercial ratepayers. Our current marketing practice does stress that the cost of a successful recycling program could be offset by reduced commercial refuse collection needs.

At this time we have developed a commercial recycling rate schedule designed to recover the cost of providing these services. For example, the monthly fee for servicing one 90-gallon recycling container weekly is \$7.00.

Timeline: Completed January 2003.

Promote and advertise multi-family commercial recycling program. Ongoing

January 2004 Progress Report: Staff continues to promote the availability of multi-family commercial recycling as a marketing tool to potential customers. We continue to provide the location of our 13 recycling drop-off sites in Scottsdale to individual residents of multi-family dwellings who wish to recycle, but have complex management, which has no interest in providing this service to its tenants.

Responsible Staff: Rick Pence, Mark Powell, James Livingston

Type of Business	Number Of Accounts	300 g	90 g	
Multi-family Apartments	13	28	10	
Business	19	10	23	
Churches	2	1	1	
Schools	20	5	93	
Total	54	44	127	
City Buildings and Parks	29	26	76	
Total	83	70	203	273
%Double use-Bus & Public Drop Off	17	23	27	50

Name	Service Address	Svc. Area	# of cans	Total Cans
Papago Area			300	90
Abram Ber MD	5011 N .Granite Reef	Papago	1	1
Ashley William H/Boardwalk Prop	3080 N. Civic Center PZ	Papago	1	
Chateauneuf Singer Cora	7070 E. 3rd Ave.	Papago		1
%Eldorado Park	Miller/Murray	Papago	3	
Center for Radiation Therapy	7337 E. Thomas Rd	Papago		1
Chaparral Park Pool	Hayden Rd. & Jackrabbit	Papago		1
Ciento Apartments W.Side	68th & Osborn	Papago	2	
Ciento Apartments E.Side	68th & Osborn	Papago	2	
City Hall	3939 Drinkwater Blvd	Papago	2	
Civic Center Library	Drinkwater Blvd.	Papago		8
Civic Center Senior Center	7375 E. 2nd St	Papago		2
Community Design Studio	75th and Indian School	Papago		2
Coronado High School	2501 N 74St	Papago		8
Desert Cove	3309 N 70 St	Papago	1	
Eco Clean	3511 N 70 St	Papago		1
Fifth Avenue Stores	6910 N. 5th Ave.	Papago	1	
ECS	1201 N 85PI	Papago		6
%Financial Services Building	7447 E. Indian School Rc	Papago	4	8

Graphics	7501 E. 2nd St	Papago	1	6	7
Indian School Park	Tennis Cts & South Office	Papago		2	2
%Memorial Garden Church	4425 E. Granite Reef	Papago	1		1
Mohave Middle Sch	5520 N 86 St	Papago		8	8
Monte Vista Apts.	3635 N .68 St	Papago		1	1
Navajo Elementary School	4525 N Granite Reef	Papago		8	8
Neuropsychology Clinic	7533 E. 1st Avenue	Papago		1	1
New Way School	1300 N 77 St	Papago	2		2
%Paiute Center	66St / Osborn	Papago	2		2
Park Orleans	3950 N Granite Reef	Papago		8	8
%Rural Metro/Firestation	Thomas and Miller	Papago	2		2
SCA Building	7380 E 2 St	Papago		2	2
SCA Building/City Offices	7380 E. 2nd St	Papago		4	4
Sally George LLC	2921 N 68th St	Papago		2	2
Scottsdale Garden	1217 N Miller	Papago	2		2
Scotts Park Terrace	1075 N Miller	Papago	2		2
Scott Toyota	6850 E Mc Dowell	Papago		3	3
Scotts Trails	8625 E Belleview	Papago	9		9
Scotts Fd for the Handicapped	7511 E Osborn Rd	Papago	4		4
Supai Middle School	6720 Continental	Papago		11	11
TGM Inc.	3624 N Bishop Ln	Papago		1	1
The Gardens	4015 N 78th St	Papago	2		2
Tres Palmas Apart/TripleStar Realty	3520 N 70th St	Papago		1	1
Villa Las Madrias	1350 N 77 St	Papago		2	2
Villa Montessori	2928 N 67th PL	Papago		2	2
Walden Condos	7950 E Starlight Wy	Papago	2		2

Yavapai Elementary	701 N. Miller Rd	Papago	8	8
Positive Potentials/Michelle Cu	7120 E. 6TH Ave	Papago	1	1
Total Cans for Papago Area			46	156

Via Linda Area

Calvis Wyant	8245 N. 85th Way	Via Linda	2	2
Chaparral High School	6935 Golddust	Via Linda	8	8
Cheyenne School	11130 E Cholla	Via Linda	2	2
Century 21	8201 N. Hayden	Via Linda	1	1
%Corporation Yard	9191 E. San Salvador	Via Linda	3	11
Desert Mountain High School	12575 E Via Linda	Via Linda	6	6
Himovitz Bldg	97th and San Salvador	Via Linda	6	6
%Mountain View Park	Mountain View and 85th	Via Linda	1	1
MtnSide Mid Sch	11256 N 128St.	Via Linda	4	4
%Palomino Library	12575 E Via Linda	Via Linda	8	8
Police Department/District 2	Via Linda	Via Linda	5	5
Pueblo Elemetary School	6320 N. 82nd St.	Via Linda	4	4
Racquet Club	9707 E Mt. View	Via Linda	4	4
%Rural Metro/Firestation	70th and Shea	Via Linda	2	2
%Rural Metro/Firestation	Via Linda and 108th	Via Linda	1	1
Sahuaro High Sch	6250 N82St	Via Linda	2	2
%Scottsdale Ranch Park	10400 E. Via Linda	Via Linda	8	8
Sequoia School	11808 N 64St	Via Linda	2	2
Southwest Home Builders	8129 87th Pl.	Via Linda	1	1
SSPW Architect	8681 E Via De Negocio	Via Linda	1	1
St. Anthony on the Desert Church	12990 E Shea	Via Linda	1	1

Via Linda Senior Center	Via Linda and 104th	Via Linda	2	2
Villa Montana Apts.	11350 E Sahuaro Dr	Via Linda	2	2
Total Cans for Via Linda Area			15	69
Pin Peak Area				
Anasazi School	12121 N 124th St	Pin Peak	5	5
Aztec School	13636 N 100th St	Pin Peak	4	4
Copper Ridge School	10101 E. Thompson Pk F	Pin Peak	3	3
Desert Canyon Mid Sch	10203 E McDowell Mtn	Pin Peak	5	5
%Horizon Park	100th St.F.L.W.	Pin Peak	1	1
%Pin. Pk Park	Pinnacle Peak Parkway	Pin Peak	2	2
Police Department/District 3	Pima and Thompson Pk	Pin Peak	1	1
%Rural Metro/Firestation	Pima and Thompson Pk	Pin Peak	1	1
%Rural Metro/Firestation	Alma School/Happy Valle	Pin Peak	1	1
%Rural Metro/Firestation	Jomax and Pima	Pin Peak	1	1
%Rural Metro/Firestation	78th and Raintree	Pin Peak	1	1
Taliesin West	12205 N. FLW Blvd.	Pin Peak	3	1
Westworld	Bell Road and FLW	Pin Peak	2	2
BERIATRIC CENTER	17500 N. Perimeter	Pin Peak	1	1
Total Cans for Pin Pk Area			9	24
Total				273